

NOTE: These minutes do not constitute a verbatim transcription of the CPC meeting.

**CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
May 4, 2006**

APPROVED

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Arthur Simons in the Committee of the Whole Room, 13th Floor of the Coleman A. Young Municipal Center, at 5:00 PM.

Roll Call: Present at the meeting were Commissioners Cason, Christensen, Glaser, Glenn, Jeffrey, Simons, Smith, Wendler, and Williams.

Welcome Back-Thomas Chrsitensen: The CPC congratulated Commissioner Christensen on his return to good health and welcomed him back to the CPC meetings.

Agenda: The Agenda was approved as submitted.

PUBLIC HRG.
Request of Salvation Army to rezone area of Grand River, Warren, 17th, Hancock and 16th from M4 to R6: CPC Deputy Director Marcus Loper noted that the Salvation Army is requesting to table the public hearing on its request to rezone the area of Grand River, Warren, 17th, Hancock and 16th from M4 to R6 for the development of an emergency shelter. Prior to holding the public hearing, the Salvation Army wanted the opportunity to meet with the community to discuss the proposal.

The Commissioners agreed to table the public hearing to a future date.

Minutes: ACTION: Commissioner Glaser moved to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 6, 2006 as submitted.
Commissioner Wendler seconded the motion.
Motioned carried.

OLD BUS.--Far East-Side Overlay Area: Further consideration was given to amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to authorize the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) to consider dimensional variances for new construction as well as for existing buildings, and to create, describe, and identify a Far Eastside Overlay Area to provide certain intensity and dimensional standards that apply to the overlay area and to correct certain cross-referencing errors. The overlay area would facilitate infill construction of single-family dwellings, two-family dwellings, multiple-family dwellings, and town houses in a 140-acre area and in conjunction with the approved Master Developer Agreement between the City of Detroit and New Far East Side Development Co., LLC. The LLC has prepared a Master Plan for the overlay area, which will be implemented in phases. The first phase is in the Fox Creek Neighborhood (New Town #1), bounded by East Jefferson, Kercheval, Manistique, Vernor, and Alter Roads.

CPC staff members Rory Bolger and Gregory Moots reviewed the scope of the ordinance and addressed questions and concerns raised at the Commission's April 20, 2006 public

hearing on this matter.

As to the concern that property taxes would increase as a result of the new construction and new improvements, CPC staff noted that property taxes are capped by Proposal A, which limits property tax increases for existing property owners to the cost-of-living, generally in the range of 2-4 percent per year. This is regardless of the actual increase in the property's value.

As to the concern regarding access via the alleys, CPC staff noted that the alleys in the area are proposed to remain open to vehicular traffic. Some of the alleys may be converted to easements and maintained by the developer or homeowners' association. The functioning of the alleys would remain unchanged from how they have functioned historically.

Regarding the criteria, amount and distribution of funds from both the City HOME program and from the developer's foundation to assist current homeowners with bringing their homes up to code, CPC staff noted that the question of home repair funding is a significant one, and one which is not fully resolved at this time. The developer has acknowledged the creation of a foundation that will augment the City's HOME program in assisting current homeowners in bringing their homes up to current building codes. The foundation would likely have more latitude than the City's program in funding rental properties or those containing households with a different range of income. This likely will have to be resolved before City Council acts on this request.

As to the concerns of St. Ambrose Church about maintaining as recreational space the area previously designated for the PIFU (People in Faith United) playground, CPC staff noted that a meeting with Fr. Pelc, pastor of St. Ambrose, is scheduled for May 9, 2006. Fr. Pelc has reportedly requested two lots near St. Ambrose school. Representatives from the Planning and Development Department and U-SNAP-BAC will also be present at the meeting. The scale of the park is the main question and much of the proposed park is on City-owned land. Given that the City Council designation of Master Developer guarantees that all City-owned land within the 700-acre area will be sold to the developer, it is up to the developer to designate any space for recreation or to sell it to anyone else.

As to building materials and compatibility to existing homes, CPC staff noted that the proposed buildings are brick on the front, so they should be comparable to, or better than, the existing housing stock.

As to the \$180,000-\$250,000 price range for the houses, the developer felt this was the price that must be charged to cover the expense of the new infrastructure, such as the installation of new east-west streets, and to realize a profit on the project. The developer felt that based on the marketing study, people will pay the proposed prices.

Regarding the concerns that increasing the density and allowing multiple-family buildings where they are currently limited would alter the character of the area, CPC staff noted that the City Council has endorsed change by its adoption of the Master Developer Agreement, in which the apartment buildings and other high-density features are shown. The provisions of the proposed overlay area are what would regulate the specifics of this increase in density and the development's exact scale.

As to the concerns of a block-club representative that neighbors had not been adequately consulted regarding the nature of the future development, the developers indicated that they have worked with various groups in the area and presented the concept to them. The developers have committed to meet with the block club whose representative spoke and involve them in the on-going community meetings. Since the public hearing, the block club representative was invited to, and reportedly attended, a neighborhood meeting with the developer held by Jay Henderson of the River Bend Community Association.

As to concern that allowing four-foot side yards was inadequate, putting the new homes too close to the existing ones, CPC staff noted that that provision actually reflects the proximity of houses as originally constructed in this area.

CPC staff addressed the concerns of Tyrone Miller, Director of the Board of Zoning Appeals, who felt that the current zoning regulations should be maintained, with all necessary dimensional variances going through the usual BZA variance process, possibly grouped by block. A rezoning to PD (Planned Development District) was also suggested as an alternative to an overlay district, as that process is common. He also stated that overlay areas ought not lessen the requirements of the underlying zoning district.

CPC staff noted that the disadvantage of rezoning to PD is that all existing property owners would be required to go through the complete PD modification process if they wished to significantly alter their property. The PD zoning is most frequently applied to land that has been cleared so as to avoid this unintended consequence. If large areas, possibly blocks, were to come before the BZA, this would introduce a fair amount of uncertainty to the development process, with the developer never knowing exactly what would be approved for any given block. In addition, the hearing process adds time and expense to the development process. The overlay zoning district option would require only one public hearing, showing the entire project, noticing everyone affected by the change, as opposed to multiple hearings on each building or group of buildings in the project. The BZA's preference for that body to consider dimensional variances as part of this infill development would still require a text amendment to the zoning ordinance, as the BZA currently is not authorized to consider dimensional variance requests for other than "existing buildings." The Ordinance amendment currently before the Commission contains language that would give the BZA that authority.

The developer met with the BZA director on May 3, 2006 to address his concerns. Mr. Miller indicated that he is supportive of the proposed project, but continues to disagree with the proposed overlay approach to expedite it as not consistent with the best interests of his agency. CPC staff noted that at each new phase of the far eastside development, a text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance will be required to expand the boundaries of the overlay area. This will provide the opportunity to revisit and reevaluate the issue of jurisdictional appropriateness as well as offering the public a recurring forum in which to voice concerns, raise questions, and offer observations.

As to the narrowness of the proposed homes, the developer indicated that a 22 foot wide home would be built on a 30 foot wide lot. CPC staff visited Stevens, Candler, Church, and Ferris Streets in Highland Park, south of McNichols between Woodward and Oakland on

May 3, 2006, where many units of infill housing have been constructed. Many of the new units were very narrow, measuring about 14' 3" in width. Pictures of the houses in Highland Park were shared with the Commission.

As to the cost savings to the developer of an overlay zoning district being approved compared to the project having to go to the BZA, the developer reported that the dollars involved would be significant, but more precise information remains to be provided.

CPC staff recommended approval of the proposed ordinance.

Commissioner Jeffrey questioned whether CPC would be setting a precedent by approving the overlay approach. Mr. Moots responded probably yes. However, the subject development represents a unique instance in that the City owns 40-60% of the property. There would not seem to be other places like this in the City. Therefore, the overlay approach would not seem appropriate in other cases. Commissioner Jeffrey noted that nevertheless, the CPC should be aware the approval of this approach is setting a precedent.

In response to Commissioner Jeffrey, Mr. Bolger noted that the developer is constructing infrastructure, particularly the building of new east/west streets to break up the long blocks between Jefferson and Kercheval. Traffic will have different means of access between Chalmers Ave. and Alter Rd. making for easier movement of traffic.

Commissioner Glaser inquired as to whether CPC staff reviewed Exhibit 5.1 of the market study. Mr. Moots noted that the development would be built and sold in phases. As units are sold, monies would be used to build more units. This same approach has been used in other larger scale developments such as Brush Park. The approach has seemed to work.

Commissioner Cason inquired as to who is going to deal with the new street layout. Mr. Bolger noted that the developer is working with the City Engineer in that regard. No residences will be relocated as the result of the construction of new housing and new streets.

Commissioner Simons proposed a worst case scenario. If the houses do not sell, should there be a change to the area? Should the City widen the lots again? Mr. Moots noted that the City would be making specific exemptions for a specific area. Doing whatever is allowed in the R2 district would always be an option.

ACTION: Commission Cason moved to accept the CPC staff recommendation. Commissioners Jeffrey and Wendler seconded the motion. Motion carried. (Commissioner Smith abstained.)

Update on
request of
1565
Erskine
to
purchase
property in
the Whole-
sale Distri-
bution
Center
No. 3:

CPC staff member Christopher Gulock provided an update on the request of 1565 Erskine LLC to purchase property in Wholesale Distribution Center No.3 for a multi-use building.

Mr. Gulock noted that at the July 7, 2005 CPC public discussion on the land sale, Joe Kuspa representing Metro Produce questioned whether the proposed mixed-use development was permitted by the Wholesale Distribution Urban Renewal Plan. The Planning & Development Department (P&DD) submitted a memorandum dated October 4, 2005 to CPC staff concluding, in part, that the proposed project constituted a minor deviation to the Plan.

The City's Zoning Ordinance states that the Board of Zoning Appeals is authorized to consider minor modifications to duly adopted development plans while major modifications are the purview of City Council. The CPC then decided not to act on the land sale request until the BZA acted on the minor deviation.

On January 24, 2006, the BZA held a hearing. Based on its review of criteria for granting variances, the BZA voted 5 to 1 on March 21, 2006 to grant the minor deviation from the Plan.

CPC staff was prepared to make a recommendation on the proposed land sale on April 6, 2006. However, prior to the meeting, Metro Produce submitted a memorandum asking the CPC to withhold approval, in part, because it was considering appealing the BZA's decision to Circuit Court. As a result, the CPC decided to receive the memorandum and not act on the land sale request. On May 1, 2006, attorneys for Metro Produce filed an appeal with the Wayne County Circuit Court asking, in part, that the Court reverse the decision and order of the BZA.

CPC staff recommended that the CPC not act on the subject land sale until the courts have decided on the matter. The developer, however, requested that the Commission not hold it, but forward it to City Council while awaiting the decision of the court.

Commissioner Williams noted that other parties had responded to an RFP released by the P&DD with offers to purchase and develop the subject property with projects compliant with the Development Plan.

Mr. Gulock noted the history. Three parties responded to an RFP let by the P&DD. It is P&DD's policy to not share the responses from applicants not selected to develop the site.

Commissioner Christensen noted new plans and funding for Eastern Market. He questioned whether the development proposal by 1565 Erskine LLC fits in with those new plans.

Jim Marusich of the P&DD felt that the issue is whether or not the proposed development represented a minor deviation from the Development Plan. BZA has determined that the development is a minor deviation. The court cannot override that City finding.

Commissioner Christensen felt that the CPC should await the decision of the court prior to taking action on the land sale.

Commissioner Jeffrey noted that the concern is whether or not the Commission should approve a land sale that may not necessarily be in accord with the Wholesale Distribution Development Plan.

ACTION: Commissioner Glenn moved to table the item until receipt of the Court's decision.

Commissioner Jeffrey seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC
HRG.--
Rezoning
area of
Lindsay,
Santa
Maria,
Biltmore
and
W.
McNichols
from R1
to PD for
multi-
family
housing:

A public hearing was held on the request of Strather and Associates to rezone property generally bounded by the alley first west of Lindsay Avenue, Santa Maria Avenue, the vacated alley first east of Biltmore Avenue, and the alley first north of W. McNichols Road from an R1 (Single-Family Residential District) zoning classification to a PD (Planned Development District) zoning classification to develop multi-family housing.

CPC staff member Marcell Todd reviewed the background information and presented the development.

The development consists of the construction of 120 units of housing. The core area would consist of 96 units of multi-family housing, 16 townhouses and 80 stacked ranches. Flanking this core to the east and west and on the west side of Lindsay north of Santa Maria would be 24 single-family units. The development also calls for additional on-site parking and landscaped areas, including a park along the to-be-vacated Gilchrist right-of-way. That vacation is necessary to form the larger plat for multi-family units on Santa Maria.

Mr. Todd noted the styles and location of the homes. Six of the houses would contain 2,000 square feet each and be priced at \$270,000. The flats would be priced at \$150,000; townhouses, \$175,000; single-family houses south of Santa Maria, \$200,000-\$250,000; and the estates, \$275,000.

He noted that the proposed units to be constructed on the west side of Lindsay and east side of Biltmore have rear yard deficiencies.

The single-family units on the west side of Lindsay north of the Santa Maria could probably be constructed as proposed within the regulations of the existing R1 district even with the inconsistency with the plat of the land, under a site condominium structure. In light of concerns raised at the Commission's April 20, 2006 meeting by Tyrone Miller, BZA, regarding rezoning for single-family development, CPC staff would reevaluate including that area in the rezoning.

Commissioner Glenn felt that the height of the housing would be incompatible with existing structures. The proposed heights would disfigure the area. Mr. Todd noted that the area contains bungalows, ranches and two full story homes. The heights of the proposed houses are within the range of existing housing heights, 28-31 feet. The developer have decreased the heights from its the previous proposal of rezoning to R3.

Mr. Todd noted that the west end of the area contains an eclectic mix of housing styles and is very much in transition. The subject development would begin to provide greater consistency. Its intent, in part, is to bring changes by replacing the neighborhood with new houses.

In response to Commissioner Williams, Mr. Todd defined the boundaries of the PD. Frontage on Oakfield is not included in the PD boundaries.

Upon questioning, Mr. Todd noted that the property in the core area is 100% vacant. Any existing structures would be demolished.

Present for the hearing were Felicia Turner of Fellowship Associates, Darlene Strickland, Director of Development, Strather and Associates, and David Donnellon of Design Resources, architect for the project.

Ms. Turner noted that Fellowship owns all of the property in the project. Eight structures, four on Lindsey, two on Gilchrist and two on Biltmore, are vacant and will be demolished.

Mr. Donnellon noted that the estates would contain 1,800-2,800 square feet of space and range in price from \$250-\$275,000. The houses would be constructed on 70 foot x 130 foot lots. The flats would contain 1,200-1,500 square feet. Every unit in the eight buildings would have individual front entrances and basements.

In response to Commissioner Williams, Mr. Donnellon noted that the existing houses fronting Outer Dr. and Oakfield are not within the boundaries of the PD.

Ms. Turner distributed and reviewed marketing materials.

In response to Commissioner Jeffrey, Ms. Turner stated that there are 26 homes on Oakfield which are in fair to stable condition. Fellowship owns 17 units on both sides of Oakfield south of Santa Maria. Some these units are vacant. Fellowship does not have any plans to acquire additional houses. In the future, the developer plans to do infill housing in that area.

Commissioner Glenn felt that the PD zone would continue to expand. All of that area would become a PD zone. The community as a whole probably does not want to be flooded with townhouses. Mr. Donnellon pointed out the location of the townhouses and flats. The remainder of the project site would consist of infill.

Again, Mr. Todd described the boundaries of the PD.

Ms. Turner noted that the petitioner has control of 17 units on both sides of Oakfield south of Santa Maria.

The following persons spoke at the public hearing.

Robert Allen, 21848 Sussex, inquired as to whether his property is affected by the rezoning. He questioned whether McNichols would be closed. Mr. Todd responded negatively.

Mary Ann Austin, 17195 Lindsay, expressed support. Ms. Austin noted that she is a resident of the project site living in one of homes yet to be demolished. She stated that ten years ago, she provided assistance to the Weed and Feed Program. At that time, the community was assured of the construction of low-income housing. Ms. Strickland noted that she would meet with Ms. Austin to discuss her situation. Upon questioning, Ms. Austin noted that she is paying property taxes but does not own the houses she is living in. Ms. Turner noted that there are plans to build affordable housing west of the project site in the future.

Commissioner Cason felt that the plan complemented the area.

PRESENTATION--
Ambassador Bridge
Gateway
Project:

The matter was taken under advisement.

A presentation was given by the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) on the Ambassador Bridge/Gateway Project.

Present for the discussion were Andrew Ziegler, Mohammed Algurahbi and other representatives of the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT).

The Ambassador Bridge/Gateway Project will address long-term congestion mitigation issues and provide direct access improvements between the Ambassador Bridge, I-75 and I-96. The project will also reconstruct I-96 and I-75, accommodate traffic for a potential future second span of the Ambassador Bridge, and access to the proposed Mexicantown International Welcome Center and Mercado currently under construction on the U.S. side. The project includes construction of a "signature" pedestrian bridge connecting East and West Mexicantown across I-75/I-96, along with extensive landscaping and other architectural treatments as part of the proposed context sensitive design elements. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) originally approved the project in 1997, with re-evaluations and approvals occurring in 1999 and 2004. Design and implementation of the project was separated into four (4) phases or contracts for design and construction. Contract #1 included rehabilitation of W. Fort Street (M-85) from Rosa Parks to Clark Street and was completed in 2003. Contract # 2 included reconstruction of the West Grand Blvd. Bridge over I-75 and was completed in early 2004. Contract # 3 of the project includes the I-96/I-75 southbound service drive and I-96 off ramp construction and was let for construction in April 2005 and will be completed in 2006.

With an implementation agreement signed between MDOT and the Detroit International Bridge Company (DIBC) in April 2004, design and implementation of the last phase or Contract #4 could proceed. Contract #4 includes mainline freeway reconstruction from south of W. Grand Boulevard to north of Michigan Avenue and provides direct connection with new ramps between the freeway and the proposed Ambassador Bridge Plaza. The design and construction of the Bridge Plaza is the responsibility of the DIBC. Design of the ramp connections between the Bridge Plaza and freeway ramps must be coordinated between MDOT and DIBC. In October 2004, a development agreement necessary to complete the remaining phase of construction was executed between MDOT and the City of Detroit for the Gateway Project. Construction is planned to begin in the fall of 2006. Contract #4 will involve closure to through traffic of both I-75 and I-96 in the area of the project to facilitate construction. While access to and from the Ambassador Bridge and access to and from the local community will be maintained during construction, maintenance of traffic with this and other key highway projects within the metropolitan region during this period is a priority. A very important public information effort will be used to coordinate the MDOT effort to address both local and regional traffic needs.

In October 2005, the DIBC responded to concerns expressed by MDOT, and requested that MDOT proceed with acquisition of properties in the area of the I-75 East Service Drive needed for implementation of the Gateway Project. With respect to DIBC's responsibility under the MDOT/DIBC April 2004 implementation agreement for construction of the plaza, an amendment to the above-noted agreement was completed in February 2006. This was necessary for MDOT to acquire additional properties needed for the Gateway Project and

was an important development for MDOT/DIBC to proceed with implementation. The additional properties must be acquired in order to vacate the adjacent city street prior to advertisement for construction of the remaining phase of the Gateway Project. In accordance with the amended MDOT/DIBC agreement, MDOT is proceeding to acquire these respective properties.

To obtain FHWA approval to proceed with advertisement for construction, written concurrence of the Gateway Project concept, specifically the footprint and connections to the U.S. roadway system, is needed from the U. S. General Services Administration (GSA). GSA provided needed concurrence in a November 3, 2005 letter to MDOT; MDOT and FHWA understanding of that concurrence was verified by FHWA in a letter to MDOT dated November 22, 2005.

The total project cost is \$206.5 million.

Mr. Ziegler described the detour truck traffic routes during the construction period of Contract #4.

In response to Commissioner Cason, Mr. Ziegler noted that some of the local traffic problems would be resolved as a result of the Ambassador Bridge/Gateway project. Truck traffic will have direct access to the freeway system.

Mr. Ziegler and Mr. Algurahbi noted that the Gateway project was undertaken to specifically address U.S. needs associated with improving connectivity to the Ambassador Bridge. The project's objectives are to address trucks in the local community, to provide direct access to the freeway system, to reconstruct the mainline freeway and to accommodate access to the proposed Welcome Center and to a potential future span of the Ambassador Bridge. The DRIC study is a study, not a project. The DRIC is a study that has occurred subsequent to the Gateway project and is being undertaken on the Canadian and the U.S. sides to address broader issues associated with border crossing. As to private proponents such as the DRTP, MichCan, and others, MDOT was present here today only to provide an update in the schedule of completion of the Gateway project. However, MDOT has eliminated those private proponents from further study.

Commissioner Christensen felt that the project and the study could not be completely separated. The DRIC study, which proposes the development of a second bridge span, most likely in the Delray area, will cause another truck traffic problem in Southwest Detroit. The Gateway project removes truck traffic from the local streets in Southwest Detroit by providing a direct access to the freeways. Constructing a second span, however, will put Southwest Detroit back to square one in terms of truck traffic not going directly to the freeway. Mr. Algurahbi noted that the DRIC study is looking at solutions to address where the truck and vehicular traffic will go. MDOT is not planning to let the trucks be in the community. The Canadians are trying to resolve the same issue on its side of the border. To make a project happen, we have to both countries work together.

Commissioner Wendler noted that the original environmental assessment for the project was completed in 1997. Changes in design have been made since that time. Mr. Ziegler agreed that the original environmental assessment completed in 1997 addressed a design different

than the one presented today. The previous design included a land bridge/plaza over the freeway system. That design was too constrained and did not provide any opportunities for expansion of that plaza into the future. As a result, MDOT re-evaluated the project in 1999 as part of the FHWA Re-evaluation of the Environmental Reassessment and proposed a different configuration. During the subsequent design phase, MDOT recognized different responsibilities between the DIBC and MDOT that needed to be addressed prior to moving forward with construction. The plaza is separate and distinct in terms of DIBC being responsible for its design and construction. MDOT is responsible for the mainline freeway and local roads. Those issues are reflected in the re-evaluation that occurred in 2004. Mr. Ziegler indicated that he would provide a copy of the Re-evaluation of the Environmental Assessment dated January 15, 2004.

In response to Commissioner Wendler regarding DIBC's March 2006 application to the U.S. Coast Guard for a second span, Mr. Ziegler noted that the plaza is the same as defined in the Gateway project. There is more detail but basically the plaza is contained within the footprint approved by the FHWA. In terms of DIBC's independent efforts and the new span, MDOT understands that the bridge would connect to the existing plaza on the U.S. side. Ramp connections to the freeway would be exactly as presented in the Gateway project. One of the original objectives of the Gateway project was to accommodate that. The FHWA requires MDOT to project traffic 20 years into the future. The Gateway project projected traffic to 2015.

Commissioner Cason cited the need for comprehensive planning and questioned whether Canada is cognizant of what MDOT is doing. Mr. Ziegler again explained the objectives of the Gateway project and the DRIC study.

Mr. Algrahbi explained the DRIC study being undertaken by the U.S. and Canada includes the study of five components-- the actual crossing, the plazas on the U.S. and Canadian sides, and the route connections to and from the plazas. Homeland security concerns on the U.S. side and Canadian Service Agency concerns on the Canadian side and other issues have to be addressed. The community has been involved throughout the entire process.

Commissioner Wendler noted that 9/11 has complicated the lives of residents in Southwest Detroit. Upon questioning, Mr. Ziegler responded that he would provide a copy of the development agreement between MDOT, FHWA and DIBC. Commissioner Wendler inquired as to whether the development agreed included financial contributions from each entity. Mr. Ziegler responded affirmatively. Upon questioning, Mr. Ziegler noted that as part of that agreement, Detroit was to provide a match contribution. However, MDOT is now going to cover the match; the City of Detroit will no longer have a match responsibility in the last phase of the project. The City had agreed to pay as much as \$4 million as part of this project. MDOT is now covering that. A letter to that effect is being prepared.

Commissioner Wendler noted a lot of discussion in the press about inspections of the Ambassador Bridge. Have the bridge inspections occurred? Are they a matter of public record? Mr. Ziegler noted that as part of the agreement between MDOT and the DIBC for the Gateway project, the DIBC is to provide annual inspection reports on the Ambassador

Bridge. The DIBC has been providing the reports. MDOT has been working with the FHWA and engineers to review the information. MDOT is satisfied with the inspections. The reports are not a matter of public record. They are confidential to MDOT and FHWA per the terms of the agreement with the DIBC. Mr. Ziegler indicated that he would provide a copy of the agreement between MDOT and the DIBC.

Commissioner Wendler inquired as to who is responsible for the property acquisition. Mr. Ziegler noted that the property acquisition, which is on the critical path, is the responsibility of MDOT per an amended agreement with the DIBC. The property in questions is in the vicinity of Howard Street and the northbound service drive. The land is for public use to provide access directly from the freeway onto the plaza. MDOT is in the process of acquiring that property. One vacant structure is on that property. MDOT noted the need of MDOT and the DIBC to vacate some streets as part of the Gateway project. Until the street vacations take place, MDOT will not be able to complete the last phase.

In response to Commissioner Wendler, Mr. Ziegler noted that the environmental assessment on the finding of no significant impact addressed the potential future on the need for a second span with respect to projected traffic coming down and touching onto the plaza. Nothing beyond that is addressed as part of the Gateway project. A separate process is occurring right now based on the request by the DIBC to the U.S. Coast Guard for a second span.

Commissioner Wendler noted that the Gateway project will eliminate serious truck traffic issues in the community.

In response to Commissioner Williams, Mr. Ziegler reviewed traffic circulation patterns during the construction period. Trucks coming off the bridge wanting to go south on I-75 would travel west on Fort St., to Clark and then to I-75. Trucks wanting to go north would utilize Fort St. to 15th, to Lafayette, to Rosa Parks, and then to I-75. Truck traffic will be separated from the local traffic. The detours will be problematic but only temporary. Upon completion of the Gateway project, trucks will circulate within the plaza and move directly onto the freeway.

Commissioner Christensen inquired as to temporary repairs to Fort St. going west from Clark Street to the City of Lincoln Park. When will permanent repairs occur?

Mark Sweeney, project manager of the Fort Street project, stated that MDOT is in the process of hiring a consultant for the design of the roadway. The roadway is in dire need of repair, and a reconstruction is the recommended treatment. However, there are issues because electrical, gas and telephone utility lines are buried 15-24" beneath the roadway. To reconstruct, the roadway has to be taken down to the aggregate and sub-sand base layer, which is approximately 30" below pavement. The electrical lines underneath the roadway have two major feeds that service the greater part of the Detroit area. Also, there is a combined sewer system that MDOT is interested in separating as part of the project. The system will come into tremendous conflict with the underground utilities. MDOT intends to still recommend the reconstruction of the roadway. That intent will continue until such time the situation proves too problematic, costly and time consuming. MDOT is concerned about the impacts to the downriver Detroit area as well as to the duration of the construction

CPC
Director
Selection
Process:

project. If the utilities have to be relocated, the duration of the project will be extended. Discussion has occurred regarding alternatives or relocation. MDOT anticipates looking into those as part of the design contract. Currently MDOT is looking at reconstructing the Fort St. roadway in 3 segments. The first segment is Fort from Schaffer to the Visger Bridge, then from the Visger Bridge to Springwells and then Springwells to Clark. If the reconstruction issues become too problematic, MDOT has proposed a lesser "fix" in partnership with the City. The reconstruction project or the lesser fix includes streetscaping and lighting.

Consideration was given to finalizing the job announcement and job description for the CPC Director position and timeframe for the CPC's portion of the selection process.

Commissioner Jeffrey suggested adding the following language to the job description--have governmental experience, particularly in city government and land use law; have experience working with the public, including community and non-profit entities; and be knowledgeable and skilled in managing budgets.

Commissioner Glaser inquired as to whether residency rules would apply. Mr. Loper noted that the City could not require applicants to live in the City of Detroit. However, the announcement could include language stating that city residency is preferred.

Commissioner Glaser requested that applicants be required to submit three professional references and three personal references.

Commissioners requested that the job announcement be sent to planning entities nationwide and include the cities of Chicago, Pittsburgh, Atlanta, New Orleans, and Cleveland.

Brief discussion ensued on the creation of criteria that would be used to evaluate the applicants. Commissioner Williams suggested using a point and weighting system.

Mr. Loper noted that the evaluation would have to be done in compliance with the Open Meetings Act. He reviewed the procedure used by City Council in selecting an ombudsman and auditor and suggested that the Commission use a similar process.

The Commission adjusted the selection timeframe to accept the receipt of resumes until June 16; begin the initial review of applicants on June 26; conduct the interviews on July 13; and make its recommendation on July 20.

Adj.:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 PM.